

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SIGMUND KOZIERACHI,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS E. PEREZ, SECRETARY,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

2:10-CV-7570-CDJ

FILED

APR 07 2014


MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk
By _____ Dep. Clerk

ORDER

AND NOW, this 7th day of April, 2014, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of Judge Lynne A. Sitariski, (Doc. No. 37), is **ADOPTED**.¹ The Court's March 13, 2013, Order, (Doc. No. 25), dismissing this case is **VACATED**. Defendant's Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement, (Doc. No. 27), is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Motion to Vacate Order Dismissing Case, (Doc. No. 28), is **DENIED AS MOOT**. Finally, the caption in this matter shall be **AMENDED** and Thomas E. Perez **SUBSTITUTED** for Hilda Solis as Defendant.² Finally, this case is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**, and the clerk of court shall mark it **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

ENTERED
APR 08 2014
CLERK OF COURT

BY THE COURT:


C. DARRELL JONES, II J.

¹When timely objections are filed to the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court must review *de novo* those portions of the report and recommendation to which objections are made. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). If there are no objections to the report and recommendation or when reviewing those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are directed, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987). In this case, plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Report and Recommendation.

²*See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 25(d).